



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Notes on Rosaceae — II

PER AXEL RYDBERG

SCHIZONOTUS

In Harms' list of Genera Conservanda, adopted by the Vienna Botanical Congress, the name *Sorbaria* A. Br. of 1864 is given among those which should be retained, and it is preferred to the older *Basilima* Raf. 1836 [should have been 1838] and the still older *Schizonotus* Lindl. of 1829. Usually the publication of the last-named genus is accredited to Wallich's Catalogue.* This catalogue, however, was not published in the sense the word "published" is usually taken, for it was merely a duplicated collector's list. Besides, *Schizonotus* is there merely a *nomen nudum*, i. e., being accompanied neither by a description nor by a synonym cited. In Lindley's Introduction to the Natural System of 1830, *Schizonotus* is really published, as Lindley points out the characteristic fruit of *Spiraea sorbifolia* and proposes the name *Schizonotus* on page 81, and on page 83 enumerates *Schizonotus* as a genus recognized by him. The combination *Schizonotus sorbifolius* was not actually published until eleven years later in the second edition of Steudel's Nomenclator.

Is there any good reason for preserving *Sorbaria* instead of either of the two older names? If there had been a rule providing that when a subgenus, or section of a genus, is raised to generic rank, then the subgeneric or sectional name should be retained, *Sorbaria* A. Br. would have had a standing, for as a name of a section of *Spiraea* it dates from 1825. Such a rule has been advocated to some extent in this country, but the Vienna Rules do not provide for anything like it. *Sorbaria* apparently was selected purely arbitrarily, perhaps because it had been adopted by Focke in Die Natürlichen Pflanzenfamilien. If *Sorbaria* had been a generally accepted genus, there might have been also some reason for its retention, but this is not the case. Scarcely any one has used

* No. 703. 1829.

it from its publication until it was used in the Pflanzenfamilien. If the choice had been only between *Sorbaria* and *Basilima* there might have been another reason why the former should be preferred; the latter was proposed by the erratic Rafinesque, who did things only by halves. But *Schizonotus* was proposed by Lindley, one of England's most prominent botanists. Perhaps the fact that Rafinesque applied the name *Schizonotus* to a different genus had something to do with it; but Rafinesque never intended to name a new genus *Schizonotus*, when he used it as generic name for *Spiraea discolor* Pursh. He simply thought that he was using it in the same sense as Lindley. It was simply a matter of wrong identification.

CHAMAEBATIARIA

This genus has been supposed to be monotypic. There exists, however, a second species, although it seems to be very rare and of a rather restricted distribution. *C. Millefolium* resembles the genus *Chamaebatia* in general habit and has often been mistaken for it, but this likeness is still greater in *Chamaebatiaria glutinosa*. Even to a trained botanist, who knows both, it would be hard, without flowers or fruit, to distinguish the latter from *Chamaebatia foliolosa*. The oldest specimen known of *C. glutinosa*, viz., its type, was sent to Dr. John Torrey, who wrote the following remarks on the sheet: "Given to me by Dr. Bolander, in San Francisco, Sept., 1872. The only specimen he had ever seen. We both supposed it might be a n. sp. of *Chamaebatia*, but it proves to be a *Spiraea*, nearly allied to my *S. Millefolium*. 4-5 feet high."

Besides the type, only the following specimens have been seen by the writer:

CALIFORNIA : 1855, *Newberry*.

NEVADA : *Ward*; 1885, *Mrs. Clements*.

PORTERANTHUS

This genus was first published under the name of *Gillenia* Moench in 1802. There is, however, an older *Gillena* Adans.* named for the same person and properly published, as it was based on *Volkameria* P. Br.† and *Tinus* L.‡

* Fam. Pl. 2 : 166. 1763.

† Hist. Jam. 214. 1756.

‡ Syst. 1010. 1759. [Ed. 10.]

LINDLEYELLA

This genus has been known as *Lindleya* H.B.K. (1823). But the name *Lindleya* had been used twice before, viz., in 1821–2 by Kunth* and by Nees.† The former is supposed to be a synonym of *Casearia* Jacq. and the latter of *Laplacea* H.B.K.,‡ published the same year. Which of the two was first published can scarcely be decided, and *Lindleya* Nees may replace *Laplacea* H.B.K. Following the rule, "Once a synonym, always a synonym," the writer was forced to propose a new name.

That the genus contains more than one species is evident. If anyone compares the illustrations cited in the North American Flora under *L. mespiloides* with those in the Botanical Register and the Fleurs des Serres, cited under *L. Schiedeana*, he will see that they can scarcely represent the same plant. *L. mespiloides* has been described as a very variable plant, perhaps partly on account of these very unlike illustrations. There are, perhaps more than two species included, but the author has no evidence that proves the existence of more than two. All the specimens found in the herbaria of the New York Botanical Garden, Harvard University, and the United States National Museum, except one, agree fairly well with the original illustration in Humboldt, Bonpland & Kunth's Nova Genera et Species. The only exception is Schiede's plant and this agrees fairly well with the illustrations in the Botanical Register and in the Fleurs des Serres.

VAUQUELINIA

When the author began the revision of this genus, he had two species at hand, which had been named *V. corymbosa*, but the first glance at the original illustration of the latter showed him that neither of the two could belong to it. One of these was referred to *V. corymbosa* by Torrey in the Botany of the Mexican Boundary Survey. This error was corrected by Watson, who renamed the plant *V. Torreyi*. The plant had been collected earlier, however, during Emory's Reconnaissance and had been described by Torrey as *Spiraea californica*. For this reason the

* Malv. 10. 1822.

† Flora 4: 299. 1821.

‡ H.B.K. Nov. Gen. et Sp. 5: 207. 1821.

name was changed to *V. californica* by Sargent, although the plant is not found within the state of California. *Spiraea californica* differs, however, somewhat from *Vauquelinia corymbosa* of the Mexican Boundary Survey, having broader and less tomentose leaves. Whether the two forms represent two distinct species or not is hard to tell, as the author has seen but one specimen resembling the type of the former, and both this specimen and the type are but fragmentary.

The other plant, named *V. corymbosa*, is a shrub from Chihuahua and best represented by Pringle's no. 5. This is characterized by its narrow leaves and has therefore received the name *V. angustifolia*. It is represented by the following specimens:

MEXICO: Santa Eulalia Mountains, state of Chihuahua, 27 May, 1885, *C. G. Pringle* 5 (flowers); 14 Aug., 1885, *Pringle* 369 (fruit); 1885, *E. Wilkinson* (flowers).

As stated before, neither of these could be referred to *V. corymbosa* Correa. Neither could they be referred to *V. Karwinskyi* Maxim. Of the latter I had seen no specimen, but Maximowicz's description was ample enough to determine this fact. The author therefore made a key and drew the description of the four species as well as he could from the herbarium material of two of them and the descriptions of the two others. While the monograph was in press some material was received from Washington, and in this material were found specimens of the two missing species. There was, however, only little to be added or modified in the descriptions. *V. corymbosa* is represented by the following specimens:

MEXICO: Ixmiquilpan, Hidalgo, Aug., 1905, *C. A. Purpus* 1384.

V. Karwinskyi by the following:

MEXICO: Alvarey, San Luis Potosi, May 19-22, 1905, *E. Palmer* 594; perhaps also, San Lorenzo Cañon, six miles south-east of Saltillo, Coahuila, April 16, 1905, *E. Palmer* 538.

SERICOTHECA

According to the Vienna Rules and Harms' list, *Holodiscus* Maxim. should be retained in preference to *Schizonotus* Raf. If there were any regard to priority, such a provision would be unnecessary, for *Schizonotus* Raf. (1838) is a homonym of the older

Schizonotus Lindl. (1830). But why should not *Sericotheca* Raf. (1838) be considered? It was just as well published as was *Schizonotus*, and was published by the same author. It is another illustration of how poorly digested and how incomplete Harms' list is. The present writer would perhaps be willing to subscribe to a list of *nomina conservanda*, provided that a good reason in each case could be given; but a list which arbitrarily retains or rejects genera published under similar conditions by Hill or Adanson, as shown by Druce in his introduction to his List of British Plants, has no standing with the present writer.

The genus *Sericotheca* is a very perplexing one, and it is very hard to draw lines between the species. Otto Kuntze reduced the whole genus to one species. Every one must admit that by so doing he went too far. The genus can be divided into two types; one with the teeth of the leaves rounded or rounded-ovate, ending in a short mucro, and achenes straight on the back; the other with the teeth lanceolate or triangular-ovate, ending in a long mucro, and the achenes more or less curved on the back. The two species would then be *S. discolor* and *S. argentea*. This would be the ultra-conservative view. Both species, especially the former, would, however, show such a diversity of forms that a number of varieties would have to be admitted. If *S. discolor* is compared with *S. microphylla* or *S. glabrescens*, few botanists would regard them as the same species. It is only when the other members of the genus are known and considered, that some would regard them as varieties of one species. C. K. Schneider, who can very well be credited to the conservative school, has been forced to admit four species. He made the statement that he could not see any difference between *Holodiscus microphyllus* and *H. dumosus* but I think this was due to the fact that he followed S. Watson in his interpretation of *H. dumosus*. Watson's idea of *H. dumosus* was an aggregate of those species which have a narrow and rather simple inflorescence, *i. e.*, *Sericotheca concolor*, *S. microphylla*, and *S. glabrescens*. *S. Boursieri* and *S. saxicola* would also have been included, had they been known to Watson. Now, the fact is that the original *Spiraea dumosa* Nutt. cannot be distinguished specifically from *Holodiscus australis* Heller. The latter Schneider admits as a good species. It is true that *Spiraea*

dumosa Nutt. and *Holodiscus australis* Heller are not exactly alike. The former represents the extreme hairy form with more than usually double-toothed leaves and the latter the more glabrate extreme with simpler teeth.

It was with some reluctance that the writer proposed his new species *S. franciscana*, not because the type is not amply distinct from *S. discolor*, but because there are forms that connect the two. The former is characterized by its thick, dark green leaves, densely short-hairy, almost velvety above; the latter by its thin leaves, glabrous or almost so above. The following specimens are to be referred to *S. franciscana*:

CALIFORNIA: Monterey, on the Mexican Boundary Survey, 1850, *C. C. Parry*; Southern Upper California, *Fitch 2* and *3*; Sonoma (Whipple's Exploration), *Bigelow 4*; Pilarcitos, Sept., 1867, *N. J. Davis 48*; San Leandro, June, 1888, *Underwood* (type); Albion Ridge, Mendocino County, June, 1903, *J. McMurphy 266*; Crystal Spring Lake, June, 1903, *Elmer 4274*; [no locality], *Thomas Bridges 100(a)*; 1868-'9, *Kellogg & Harford 201*; Crystal Spring Lake, Sept. 2, 1902, *Baker 1552*; Ukiah, Mendocino County, July 11, 1902, *Heller*; Duncan's Mills, July 18, 1882, *M. E. Jones 3579*; Santa Lucia Mountains, June, 1898, *R. A. Plaskett 161*; Mendocino, June, 1898, *H. E. Brown 805*; Coast Hills, San Luis Obispo County, May, 1885, *Mrs. Summers 95*.

S. pachydisca Rydb. of Mexico is intermediate between *S. discolor* and *S. dumosa* in leaf-form, but differs from both in the much more developed disk in the mouth of the hypanthium. This may be the same as *Schizonotus argenteus intermedius* O. Kuntze, but Kuntze's description is too incomplete.

It is strange that *Spiraea Boursieri* Carr. has not been recognized, notwithstanding the excellent figure published in the *Revue Horticole*.* The few specimens in existence in our herbaria have been included in *S. dumosa*, as interpreted by S. Watson, perhaps on account of its small and simple inflorescence. *S. Boursieri* differs, however, from *S. microphylla* and *S. concolor* in the shape of the leaves and the much larger flowers. It has the largest flowers of all the United States species known. To it may be referred:

* 1859: f. 108.

CALIFORNIA: Yosemite Valley, 1872, *J. Torrey*; *Thomas Bridges* 100.

NEVADA: Clear Creek Cañon, Ormsby County, Aug. 6, 1902, *Baker* 1431.

To *S. concolor* are referred, besides the type:

CALIFORNIA: Long Meadow, Tulare County, June 7-14, 1888, *Edward Palmer* 187; Mt. San Antonio, July, 1901, *Le Roy Abrams* 1917; Coyote Creek, July 30, 1904, *Culbertson* [Baker's distribution no.] 4332.

NEVADA: Western Nevada, 1865, *Stretch*; Pine Forest Mountains, July, 1901, *Griffiths & Morris* 196.

To *S. Schaffneri* are referred the following:

MEXICO: San Luis Potosí, 1879, *Schaffner* 451; *Parry & Palmer* 223.

ARIZONA: Bill Williams Mountains, June, 1883, *H. H. Rusby* 588.

S. obovata is closely related to *S. glabrescens*, but differs in the larger leaves, which are densely villous-pubescent above. It resembles also *S. dumosa* but its leaves are decidedly glandular-atomiferous. The following specimens are referred to it:

CALIFORNIA: Woods on Truckee River, July 17, 1886, *Sonne* (type); Bear Valley, Calaveras County, Aug. 23, 1892, *Geo. Hansen* 234.

Spiraea fissa Lindl. has been improperly understood. By the courtesy of the Director of the Kew Gardens, the New York Botanical Garden has received a fine tracing of the type and also some fragments. Kuntze's type of *Schizonotus argenteus alpestris* is now in the herbarium of the N. Y. Botanical Garden and there is also a duplicate of *Holodiscus argenteus bifrons* Focke. The former is merely a reduced form and the latter a rather luxuriant one of *S. fissa*. Neither deserves even a varietal rank. Kuntze recognized also a var. *fissus*, based on *Spiraea fissa* Lindl. Although he placed the two varieties in different divisions of the key, they can not be separated. The key is not workable, and as he cites no specimens, some of his varieties will remain unknown. The var. *alpestris* is the only one represented in his herbarium.

S. velutina is a closely related species, which has been confused with it and with *S. argentea*. It has the habit of *S. fissa*,

but has more hairy leaves and fruit like that of *S. argentea*. It may be *Schizonotus argenteus mexicanus* O. Kuntze, but it is scarcely *Spiraea mexicana* Schiede. I refer to it the following specimens:

MEXICO: Sierra de San Filipe, Oaxaca, Sept. 25, 1894, *Charles L. Smith 821*; 1894, *E. W. Nelson 1085*; 1894, *Pringle 5734*.

FILIPENDULA

As represented in North America, this genus could very well be divided into 4 genera, viz.:

1. ULMARIA Hill, with *F. Ulmaria* and *F. demodata*.
2. FILIPENDULA Adans., with *F. Filipendula*.
3. THECANISIA Raf., with *F. rubra*.
4. [Unnamed], with *F. kamtschatica* and *F. occidentalis*.

Several of the Asiatic species, however, combine the characters of two or more of these genera and the generic lines disappear altogether. It was therefore deemed advisable to keep them as a single genus.

HORKELIA

Three species of this genus had been published since my Monograph of the North American Potentilleae.* These are: *H. glandulosa* Eastwood, *H. Wilderae* Parish, and *H. Rydbergii* Elmer. All of these are known from the type localities only. Six were proposed as new in the North American Flora, viz.: *H. truncata*, *H. Brownii*, *H. tenuisecta*, *H. integrifolia*, *H. pulchra*, and *H. hispidula*. Of these *H. truncata* and *H. tenuisecta* were partly known to the writer when his monograph was prepared, but were there included in other species. Two sheets of the former were included in *H. platycalyx* which it resembles in floral structure. These specimens were:

LOWER CALIFORNIA: Guadalupe Mountains, 1883, *C. R. Orcutt 840* (labeled *Horkelia californica paucifoliata* Wats.).

They were not very good specimens and therefore not so critically studied. Better specimens have been seen since. The best of these is in the herbarium of the University of California. Although the specimen was from a cultivated plant, it was designated as the type.

* Mem. Dep. Bot. Columbia Univ. 2: 1898.

H. tenuisecta was better known, but the author mistook it for *H. tenella* (*H. fusca tenella* S. Wats.). A reexamination of the type of the latter proved it to belong to a species which the writer thought undescribed. *H. tenuisecta* is therefore the same as *H. tenella*, in greater part, of the writer's monograph. To it belong the following specimens:

WASHINGTON: Falcon Valley, July 28, 1882, *Suksdorf 2492* (type), and 1896, 60; Ice Cave, Trout Lake, Aug. 5, 1894, *F. E. Lloyd*.

To the true *H. tenella* belong the following:

CALIFORNIA: San Joaquin River, Fresno Co., 1891, *Coville & Funston 1836*; Hogg Ranch, Yosemite National Park, 1902, *Hall & Babcock 3378*; Morgan, Tehama Co., 1903, *4392*; Cannel Meadows, Tulare Co., 1904, *5117*.

Horkelia hispidula is related to *H. sericata* but lacks the silvery pubescence characteristic of that species. In habit it resembles *H. Micheneri* also and may easily be mistaken for it, if the floral characters are overlooked, the sepals and bractlets being very different. *H. hispidula* is known only from the type locality.

H. Brownii is related to *H. tenella* and *H. parviflora*. It differs from the former in the dense pubescence and from the latter in the deeply divided leaflets and the open inflorescence. To it is to be referred the following specimen, besides the type:

CALIFORNIA: Mt. Shasta, 1892, *E. Palmer 2448a*.

H. integrifolia is related to *H. tridentata* but differs in the entire leaflets and the appressed pubescence of the stem and the petioles. It is known only from the type locality.

H. pulchra is related to *H. congesta* but the leaflets are 13–17 instead of about 9 and they are deeply cleft into lanceolate divisions. It also is known only from the type station.

One change of name was necessary. *H. bernardina* Rydb. was substituted for *H. Parryi* Rydb., there being an older *H. Parryi* Greene. *H. Parryi* Rydb. was based on *H. Bolanderi Parryi* S. Wats. It may be that Dr. Greene had the latter in mind, when he proposed the new species, but there is no evidence that he did, for he cited no synonym, nor in any other way referred to Watson's variety. The types of both *H. Bolanderi Parryi* S. Wats. and *H. Parryi* Greene were collected by Parry in southern California, but at different localities and in different years.

HORKELIELLA

The writer thought it advisable to raise the subgenus *Horkeliella* of *Horkelia* to generic rank. Even if the characters separating it from *Horkelia* and *Ivesia* are not very prominent ones, the writer's opinion is that the arrangement here adopted will make the treatment of the tribe much clearer. To the two species included in the subgenus is to be added a third one, *Horkelia Congdonis*.

IVESIA

The writer restored this genus in the North American Flora, after having included it in *Horkelia* in his Monograph of the North American Potentilleae. In the latter publication he reduced it, simply because one species, *I. argyrocoma*, has more or less dilated filaments. The species is in every other respect as good a species of *Ivesia* as any of the *I. unguiculata* group. The type species of the genus, *I. Gordonii*, has but 5 stamens and a more scape-like stem, but the structure of the flower and the general habit are otherwise practically the same. In *I. pygmaea*, *I. Shockleyi*, *I. setosa*, and *S. Baileyi*, the hypanthium is much flatter than usual in the genus; it has a distinct thickening or disk in the throat, and the filaments are short, inclined towards the center of the flower, thus approaching the structure of the flowers of the genus *Comarella*. These species (except sometimes the last one) have leaves with spinulose-tipped teeth or lobes, and only 5 stamens. It is not advisable to remove these species from *Ivesia*, however, for at least the first two have otherwise the habit of *I. Gordonii* and other 5-stamened species of the *I. lycopodioides* group; and another species, *I. chaetophora* Rydb., has the same habit and the same spinulose-tipped teeth or divisions, but a more campanulated hypanthium, no thickened disk, and 10 stamens.

The species of the *I. eremica* group approach the genus *Potentilla* in the almost clawless petals and the less developed hypanthium, but otherwise they are typical *Ivesias*.

The following species were proposed as new: *I. Tweedyi*, *I. megalopetala*, and *I. setosa*.

The first one was included in *Horkelia utahensis* in my Monograph; the other two were there treated as varieties of *H. Gordonii* and *H. Baileyi*, respectively.

To *I. Tweedyi* belong, besides the type, the following specimens:
WASHINGTON: Cascade Mountains, 1882, *T. S. Brandegees*.

I. callida (Hall) Rydb. was transferred from *Potentilla*, and placed in the *I. eremica* group, although not so closely related to the other members.

PURPUSIA

P. saxosa is still unknown except from the type locality. Other specimens have been referred to this species, as for instance, *Heller 8297*, but this belongs to *Potentilla acuminata* Hall; some others belong to *Potentilla saxosa* Lemmon. *Ivesia Baileyi* may also be mistaken for it. The few pistils on a stalked receptacle and the absence of bractlets distinguish it at a glance from all three.

COMARELLA AND STELLARIOPSIS

These two genera were treated as in my monograph.

NEW YORK BOTANICAL GARDEN.